

# IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

## Digital Repository

---

Chemistry Publications

Chemistry

---

1999

## Vacancy Ordering and Bonding Competition in the Group 9 Tellurides $M_xTe_2$ ( $M = Rh, Ir$ ; $0.75 \leq x \leq 2$ ): A Theoretical Study

Chi-Shen Lee

*Iowa State University*

Gordon J. Miller

*Iowa State University*, [gmillers@iastate.edu](mailto:gmillers@iastate.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/chem\\_pubs](http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/chem_pubs)

 Part of the [Materials Chemistry Commons](#), [Other Chemistry Commons](#), and the [Physical Chemistry Commons](#)

The complete bibliographic information for this item can be found at [http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/chem\\_pubs/831](http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/chem_pubs/831). For information on how to cite this item, please visit <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/howtocite.html>.

---

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Chemistry at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chemistry Publications by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

---

# Vacancy Ordering and Bonding Competition in the Group 9 Tellurides $M_xTe_2$ ( $M = Rh, Ir$ ; $0.75 \leq x \leq 2$ ): A Theoretical Study

## Abstract

The Rh–Te and Ir–Te binary systems for 50–78 atom % Te show remarkable differences in their phase and structural features at temperatures below 1100 °C. Extended Hückel calculations are employed to investigate the influence of various orbital interactions on these differences. In general, a strong interrelationship among valence electron count, orbital characteristics at and near the Fermi levels, and relative strengths of M–Te, Te–Te, and M–M orbital interactions control the occurrence and structures of various  $M_xTe_2$  compounds ( $0.75 \leq x \leq 2$ ). Stronger Ir–Te than Rh–Te orbital interactions lead to the different low-temperature structures of  $IrTe_2$  (CdI<sub>2</sub>-type) and  $RhTe_2$  (pyrite-type), but then short and intermediate-range Te–Te interactions lead to the pyrite-type structure for the defect phases  $M_{1-u}Te_2$ . At temperatures above 600 °C,  $RhTe_2$  (pyrite-type) is unstable relative to disproportionation to the “stuffed” CdI<sub>2</sub>-type  $Rh_{1+x}Te_2$  and the defect pyrite-type  $Rh_{1-u}Te_2$ . The Rh-rich phases,  $Rh_{1+x}Te_2$ , show ordered vacancies in alternating layers of octahedral holes and can be formulated as  $(Rh_3)_x(Rh)_{1-2x}Te_2$  ( $x \leq 1/2$ ) and  $(Rh_3)_{1-x}(Rh)_{4x-2}Te_2$  ( $x \geq 1/2$ ) to emphasize the occurrence of linear  $Rh_3$  units in their structures. The pattern of vacancies in these structures follows the preference of  $Rh_{4n+3}$  oligomers over  $Rh_{4n+1}$  chains. Charge-iterative calculations of Rh atomic orbital energies in  $Rh_{1+x}Te_2$  ( $x = 0.0, 0.5, 1.0$ ) were carried out to analyze the electronic properties of Rh throughout the series. As  $x$  increases, Rh–Te orbital interactions become less attractive and the concentration of Rh–Rh repulsive interactions grows. Both effects control the maximum value of  $x$  (observed to be 0.84) for this series and influence the pattern of occupied octahedral holes in the close-packed tellurium matrix.

## Disciplines

Materials Chemistry | Other Chemistry | Physical Chemistry

## Comments

Reprinted (adapted) with permission from *Inorg. Chem.*, 1999, 38 (22), pp 5139–5150. Copyright 1999 American Chemical Society.

# Vacancy Ordering and Bonding Competition in the Group 9 Tellurides $M_xTe_2$ ( $M = Rh, Ir$ ; $0.75 \leq x \leq 2$ ): A Theoretical Study

Chi-Shen Lee and Gordon J. Miller\*

Department of Chemistry, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50010

Received June 4, 1999

The Rh–Te and Ir–Te binary systems for 50–78 atom % Te show remarkable differences in their phase and structural features at temperatures below 1100 °C. Extended Hückel calculations are employed to investigate the influence of various orbital interactions on these differences. In general, a strong interrelationship among valence electron count, orbital characteristics at and near the Fermi levels, and relative strengths of M–Te, Te–Te, and M–M orbital interactions control the occurrence and structures of various  $M_xTe_2$  compounds ( $0.75 \leq x \leq 2$ ). Stronger Ir–Te than Rh–Te orbital interactions lead to the different low-temperature structures of  $IrTe_2$  (CdI<sub>2</sub>-type) and  $RhTe_2$  (pyrite-type), but then short and intermediate-range Te–Te interactions lead to the pyrite-type structure for the defect phases  $M_{1-x}Te_2$ . At temperatures above 600 °C,  $RhTe_2$  (pyrite-type) is unstable relative to disproportionation to the “stuffed” CdI<sub>2</sub>-type  $Rh_{1+x}Te_2$  and the defect pyrite-type  $Rh_{1-x}Te_2$ . The Rh-rich phases,  $Rh_{1+x}Te_2$ , show ordered vacancies in alternating layers of octahedral holes and can be formulated as  $(Rh_3)_x(Rh)_{1-2x}Te_2$  ( $x \leq 1/2$ ) and  $(Rh_3)_{1-x}(Rh)_{4x-2}Te_2$  ( $x \geq 1/2$ ) to emphasize the occurrence of linear  $Rh_3$  units in their structures. The pattern of vacancies in these structures follows the preference of  $Rh_{4n+3}$  oligomers over  $Rh_{4n+1}$  chains. Charge-iterative calculations of Rh atomic orbital energies in  $Rh_{1+x}Te_2$  ( $x = 0.0, 0.5, 1.0$ ) were carried out to analyze the electronic properties of Rh throughout the series. As  $x$  increases, Rh–Te orbital interactions become less attractive and the concentration of Rh–Rh repulsive interactions grows. Both effects control the maximum value of  $x$  (observed to be 0.84) for this series and influence the pattern of occupied octahedral holes in the close-packed tellurium matrix.

## Introduction

Binary transition metal chalcogenides attract extensive investigation due to fundamental interest in the nature of their metal–metal, metal–chalcogenide, and chalcogenide–chalcogenide bonding, as well as their potential applications via electronic phase transitions and intercalation chemistry.<sup>1</sup> In particular, the dichalcogenides  $MX_2$  ( $X = S, Se, Te$ ) form either two-dimensional (2D) or three-dimensional (3D) structures,<sup>2</sup> depending on the identity of both M and X. According to thorough structural, physical, and theoretical investigations, the dimensionality of a particular dichalcogenide depends on the d electron count of the transition element and the relative energies of the metal d and chalcogen sp orbitals.<sup>3</sup> For the transition metal disulfides  $MS_2$ , Burdett and McLarnan have shown<sup>4</sup> that disulfide groups ( $S_2^{2-}$ ) prevail if the enthalpy change for the process  $M^{2+}(g) \rightarrow M^{4+}(g) + 2e^-$  exceeds ca. 80 eV. If this enthalpy change is less than 80 eV, isolated sulfide ions ( $S^{2-}$ ) occur. Rouxel and co-workers generalized this concept for all chalcogenides by using a qualitative electronic energy band argument based on the relative electronegativities of the metal atoms and the chalcogen.<sup>5</sup> Their approach indicates a redox competition between the cation d and anion sp electronic band levels, which leads to various structural preferences and details, viz., interatomic distances. They have also established differ-

**Table 1.** Atomic Orbital Energy Parameters for Extended Hückel Calculations

atom	orbital	$H_{ii}$ (eV)	$\zeta_1$	$c_1$	$\zeta_2$	$c_2$
Te	5s	−20.80	2.51			
	5p	−14.80	2.16			
Rh	5s	−9.17	2.14			
	5p	−3.97	2.10			
Ir	4d	−12.71	5.54	0.5561	2.40	0.6117
	6s	−11.36	2.50			
	6p	−4.50	2.20			
Rh (“RhTe <sub>2</sub> ”)	5d	−12.17	5.80	0.6698	2.56	0.5860
	5s	−9.65	2.14			
	5p	−4.26	2.10			
Rh (Rh <sub>3</sub> Te <sub>4</sub> )	4d	−13.56	5.54	0.5561	2.40	0.6117
	5s	−9.37	2.14			
	5p	−3.94	2.10			
Rh (“RhTe”)	4d	−13.09	5.54	0.5561	2.40	0.6117
	5s	−8.68	2.14			
	5p	−3.23	2.10			
	4d	−11.92	5.54	0.5561	2.40	0.6117

ences within various anionic partial structures depending upon the occurrence of intermediate range Te···Te interactions to produce “polymerized” Te networks.


Tellurium produces many different anionic groupings.<sup>5</sup> The transition metal ditellurides, with few exceptions, form either the CdI<sub>2</sub>-type or the pyrite-type structure. Jobic et al. identify five different classes of ditellurides on the basis of tellurium–tellurium and metal–metal interactions:<sup>2</sup>

1. True 2D CdI<sub>2</sub>-type phases:  $ZrTe_2$  and  $HfTe_2$  have nearly ideal  $c/a$  ratios of 1.68 and show no evidence for metal–metal bonding (i.e., no observed superstructures in the (001) planes exist). These are d<sup>0</sup> metal compounds.

- (1) (a) Hulliger F. *Struct. Bonding* (Berlin) **1967**, 4, 83. (b) Hulliger F. In *Structural Chemistry of Layer-Type Phases*; Levy, F., Ed.; Reidel: Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1976.
- (2) Jobic, S.; Brec, R.; Rouxel, J. *J. Alloys Compd.* **1992**, 178, 253.
- (3) Jobic, S.; Brec, R.; Rouxel, J. *J. Solid State Chem.* **1992**, 96, 169.
- (4) Burdett, J. K.; McLarnan, T. J. *Inorg. Chem.* **1982**, 21, 1119.
- (5) Rouxel, J. *Comments Inorg. Chem.* **1993**, 14, 207.

**Table 2.** Results from EHT Calculations on  $[\text{MTe}_6]$  and  $[\text{M}(\text{Te}_2)_6]$  Fragments (eV)



	$[\text{RhTe}_6]$	$[\text{IrTe}_6]$	$[\text{Rh}(\text{Te}_2)_6]$	$[\text{Ir}(\text{Te}_2)_6]$
$E(t_{2g})$	-12.34 (3x)	-11.69 (3x)	-12.37 (2x) -12.18 (1x)	-11.88 (2x) -11.58 (1x)
$E(e_g)$	-9.31 (2x)	-8.10 (2x)	-9.43 (2x)	-8.61 (2x)
$E(\text{Te}_2 \sigma_p^*)$			-9.19 to -7.78	-9.20 to -7.46
$E(\text{Te } 5p)$	-16.58 to -13.46	-16.85 to -13.46		
$E(\text{Te}_2 \sigma_p, \pi, \pi^*)$			-17.10 to -12.59	-17.27 to -12.59

**Figure 1.** Top: Variations in the shortest Rh-Te and Te-Te distances in the defect pyrite-type  $\text{Rh}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2$  phases as a function of  $u$ .<sup>8</sup> Bottom: Variations in the shortest Rh-Te and Rh-Rh distances in the stuffed  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  phases as a function of  $x$ .<sup>7</sup>

2. 2D polymerized, distorted  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type phases:  $\text{MoTe}_2$  and  $\text{WTe}_2$  show through-layer and within-layer  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  “bonding” (ca. 3.66 and 3.50 Å, respectively, between these Te atoms). [In the  $\text{CdI}_2$  structure for  $\text{MTe}_2$ , *within-layer*  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  “bonding” refers to a single plane of Te atoms, *through-layer*  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  “bonding” occurs between planes of Te atoms within each Te-M-Te slab, and *between-layer*  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  “bonding” occurs between planes of Te atoms between two Te-M-Te slabs.] Longer between-layer distances (greater than 4.00 Å) maintain the proposed 2D character of these phases. Significant metal-metal bonding also occurs as the 2D triangular net of metals distorts into ribbons.

3. 3D polymeric, 2D-derived  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type phases with metal-metal bonding:  $\text{NbTe}_2$  and  $\text{TaTe}_2$  show weak  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  polymerization between layers (ca. 3.60 Å) and significant metal-metal bonding within each layer.


4. 3D polymeric, 2D-derived  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type phases without metal-metal bonding:  $\text{IrTe}_2$ ,  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ ,  $\text{CoTe}_{1.7}$ ,  $\text{PdTe}_2$ , and  $\text{PtTe}_2$  show weak  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  “bonding” between layers as demonstrated by their low  $c/a$  ratios of ca. 1.27–1.38. No metal-metal bonding is apparent.

**Figure 2.** Ball-and-stick and polyhedral representations of the structures of  $\text{CdI}_2$  (top) and pyrite (bottom).  $\text{IrTe}_2$  adopts the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type arrangement;  $\text{RhTe}_2$  adopts the pyrite structure.**Figure 3.** Energy band diagram and total DOS for  $\text{IrTe}_2$  in the  $\text{CdI}_2$  structure. The dashed line is the calculated Fermi level for  $\text{IrTe}_2$ . Various regions of the DOS are labeled, and the Te contribution to the total DOS is shaded in the DOS curve.


5. 3D pyrite-type (and marcasite-type) phases:  $\text{MnTe}_2$ ,  $\text{FeTe}_2$ ,  $\text{RuTe}_2$ ,  $\text{OsTe}_2$ ,  $\text{NiTe}_2$ , and  $\text{RhTe}_2$  vary in the extent of weak  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  “bonding” with no metal-metal bonding apparent.

In all cases, each metal atom is coordinated by an octahedral environment of telluride-based ligands, which are either isolated telluride ions, ditelluride groups, or, as in type 4 compounds, a polymeric sheet of weakly interacting tellurium atoms. Furthermore, the formal oxidation states of the metal atoms range from +2 to +4. Metal-metal bonding occurs for the early transition elements with  $d^1$ – $d^3$  electronic configurations.

The observed trend in structures with  $d$  electron count and period of the transition metal is certainly striking.<sup>2</sup> For the fifth- and sixth-period metals, the group 9 elements (Rh and Ir)



**Figure 4.** Total DOS for RhTe<sub>2</sub> in the pyrite structure. The dashed line is the calculated Fermi level for RhTe<sub>2</sub>. Various regions of the DOS are labeled, and the Te contribution to the total DOS is shaded in the DOS curve.




**Figure 5.** Variation in Te–Te distance with occupation of the  $\sigma_p^*$  orbital in  $(\text{Te}-\text{Te})^{(2+q)-}$  dimers. At each point, the total valence electron energy is minimized for the given charge. Te–Te distances in several ditellurides are indicated on the graph.

represent a special transition point between the 3D pyrite-type and the 3D–polymerized 2D CdI<sub>2</sub>-type structures. In fact, the equilibrium solid phases Rh<sub>x</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> and Ir<sub>x</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> in the neighborhood of MTe<sub>2</sub> exhibit interesting structural changes as self-intercalation processes and vacancy ordering occur at the metal sites in the telluride matrix.<sup>7</sup> This work specifically examines the structural preferences for these group 9 tellurides, M<sub>x</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> ( $0.75 \leq x \leq 2.00$ ), by analyzing the orbital interactions and valence electron concentrations involved for the various compounds. We will address the arrangement of vacancies and self-intercalated species from the viewpoint of metal–tellurium, metal–metal, and tellurium–tellurium orbital interactions and the types of local chemical environments that arise.

### Phases in the Rh<sub>x</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> and Ir<sub>x</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> Systems

An examination of the binary phase diagrams for Rh–Te and Ir–Te shows expected similarities but still some remarkable differences between the equilibrium phases existing in these two systems. The information published for the Rh–Te system is



**Figure 6.** Energy band dispersion curves for the  $e_g/\sigma_p^*$  bands in RhTe<sub>2</sub>. The dashed line is the calculated Fermi level for RhTe<sub>2</sub>. Crystal orbitals at the zone center ( $\Gamma$ ) are labeled.

**Table 3.** Results of EHT Calculations on CdI<sub>2</sub>- and Pyrite-Type Structures for RhTe<sub>2</sub> and IrTe<sub>2</sub> Using Various Cutoff Distances for the Inclusion of Interatomic Orbital Overlaps<sup>a</sup>

	RhTe <sub>2</sub>		IrTe <sub>2</sub>	
	pyrite-type	CdI <sub>2</sub> -Type	pyrite-type	CdI <sub>2</sub> -type
M–Te (Å)	2.66 (6x) 4.10 (2x) 4.26 (6x)	2.57 (6x) 4.54 (6x) 4.61 (4x)	2.71 (6x) 4.01 (2x) 4.52 (6x)	2.64 (6x) 4.65 (6x) 4.73 (4x)
Te–Te (Å)	2.97 (1x) 3.56 (6x) 3.95 (6x)	3.45 (6x) 3.83 (6x)	3.44 (1x) 3.56 (6x) 4.08 (6x)	3.53 (6x) 3.93 (6x)
M–M (Å)	4.56 (12x)	3.83 (6x)	4.67 (12x)	3.93 (6x)
Total Valence Electron Energies (eV)				
$\rho = 3.55 \text{ Å}$	0.00	0.52	0.00	1.14
$\rho = 3.60 \text{ Å}$	1.83	0.52	3.09	1.14
$\rho = 3.90 \text{ Å}$	1.83	2.47	3.09	1.14
$\rho = 4.05 \text{ Å}$	3.49	2.47	3.62	3.23

<sup>a</sup> Short and intermediate range distances are listed.

more detailed,<sup>8</sup> and seemingly more complex, than that for the Ir–Te system.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, in the region 50–78 atom % tellurium, all structures are derived from either the CdI<sub>2</sub>-type or the pyrite-type structures.

Comprehensive studies of the Rh<sub>x</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> ( $0.75 \leq x \leq 2.00$ ) system with respect to equilibrium phases and structural characterizations have been reported by Kjekshus et al.,<sup>8</sup> Krachler et al.,<sup>10</sup> and Abadie et al.<sup>7</sup> RhTe<sub>2</sub> adopts the pyrite structure, but cannot be obtained as a stoichiometric compound above 550 °C. At these higher temperatures, RhTe<sub>2</sub> is unstable relative to a combination of a defect pyrite-type (Rh<sub>1–u</sub>Te<sub>2</sub>) and a self-intercalated CdI<sub>2</sub>-type (Rh<sub>1+x</sub>Te<sub>2</sub>). Above ca. 1100 °C, Rh<sub>1+x</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> and “Te”(l) (an unknown liquid phase) are the equilibrium phases. In fact, a 2D (or, rather, polymerized 2D) structure of stoichiometric “RhTe<sub>2</sub>” is never reported. The defect pyrite-type phases, Rh<sub>1–u</sub>Te<sub>2</sub>, show no ordering of vacancies on the metal sites above 400 °C for  $u < 0.20$ . Rh<sub>0.75</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> ( $u = 0.25$ ), or Rh<sub>3</sub>Te<sub>8</sub>, exhibits rhombohedral symmetry with an ordering of vacancies in the pyrite-type framework and decomposes peritectically at ca. 630 °C to Rh<sub>1–u</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> and Te.<sup>8</sup> Structural characterization of these phases reveals trends in Rh–Te and

(6) Böttcher, P. *Angew. Chem.* **1988**, *100*, 781; *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.* **1988**, *27*, 759.


(7) Abadie, V.; Jobic, S.; Krachler, R.; Ipser, H.; Orion, I.; Brec, R. *J. Alloys Compd.* **1998**, *268*, 50.

(8) Kjekshus, A.; Rakke, T.; Andersen, A. F. *Acta Chem. Scand.* **1978**, *A32*, 209.


(9) Hocking, E. F.; White, J. G. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1960**, *64*, 1042.

(10) Krachler, R.; Ipser, H. *Z. Metallkd.* **1996**, *87*, 262.






**Figure 7.** Crystal structure of  $\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_8$ . Shaded circles are Rh atoms; open circles are Te atoms. The short Te—Te dimers are indicated by the solid black bar; the longer Te—Te dimers are shown by the shaded bars. Rh—Te contacts are solid lines. The unit cell is also indicated by the dashed lines.



**Figure 8.** Total DOS curves for (left)  $\text{RhTe}_2$  and (right)  $\text{Rh}_{0.75}\text{Te}_2$  in the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type structures (both are hypothetical models). The projections of Te atomic orbitals to the total DOS are shown. The dashed lines correspond to the calculated Fermi levels. The peak in the DOS of  $\text{Rh}_{0.75}\text{Te}_2$  below  $-10.0$  eV, which is absent in the DOS of  $\text{RhTe}_2$ , is a strong admixture of orbitals from the two-coordinate Te atoms ( $\text{Te}^{(2b)}$ ) and Rh atoms.

Te—Te distances shown in Figure 1. Note the sharp drop in the Te—Te distance as  $u$  increases from 0 to 0.1 in  $\text{Rh}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2$ , while there is little change in the Rh—Te distance. Furthermore, rhombohedral  $\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_8$  shows two crystallographically inequivalent Te—Te dimers in a 3:1 ratio and, likewise, two distinct Te—Te distances. The vacancy sites in the metal substructure are surrounded by six shorter dimers (Te—Te:  $2.82 \text{ \AA}$ ), and each Rh site is coordinated by four shorter and two longer dimers (Te—Te:  $2.89 \text{ \AA}$ ).

The Rh-rich phases,  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ , have been prepared and structurally characterized for various compositions,  $0.15 \leq x \leq 0.84$ .<sup>7</sup> Rh can be gradually added to the interlayer sites of a  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type “ $\text{RhTe}_2$ ” to form the observed series of compounds intermediate between the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type and the NiAs-type. Three distinct types of phases were identified by this study.  $\text{Rh}_{1.15}\text{Te}_2$  adopts a hexagonal  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type structure with the layers of octahedral holes in the Te close-packed matrix occupied alternately 100% and 15% by Rh atoms.  $\text{Rh}_{1.52}\text{Te}_2$  forms in the monoclinic  $\text{Cr}_3\text{S}_4$ -type structure with alternating metal occupancies of 100% and 52% in the sheets of octahedral holes. Finally,  $\text{Rh}_{1.84}\text{Te}_2$  is a defect, hexagonal NiAs-type, with 100% and 84%



**Figure 9.** Total DOS curves for (left)  $\text{RhTe}_2$  and (right)  $\text{Rh}_{0.75}\text{Te}_2$  in the pyrite-type structures. The projections of Te atomic orbitals to the total DOS are shown. The dashed lines correspond to the calculated Fermi levels. The strong peaks in both DOS curves near  $-12.5$  eV are Rh  $t_{2g}$  orbitals. The appearance of a shoulder at  $-12.0$  eV in the DOS of  $\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_8$  below  $-10.0$  eV, which is absent in the DOS of  $\text{RhTe}_2$ , is assigned to orbitals from Te atoms surrounding each metal site vacancy in the pyrite network.

**Table 4.** Results from Extended Hückel Calculations on  $\text{M}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2$  for Defect  $\text{CdI}_2$ -Type and Pyrite-Type Structures

$u(\text{Pyrite})$	$E_F$ (eV)	$q(\text{Rh})$	$q(\text{Te})$	$p(\text{Rh—Te})$	$p(\text{Te—Te})$
0.0	−9.80	9.36	5.82	0.250	0.215
0.125	−9.91	9.19	5.78 ( $5/8$ )	0.257	0.225
			6.14 ( $3/8$ )		
0.25	−10.20	9.04	5.72 ( $1/4$ )	0.270	0.227
			6.09 ( $3/4$ )		0.239 (3x)
					0.191 (1x)


$u(\text{CdI}_2)$	$E_F$ (eV)	$q(\text{Rh})$	$q(\text{Te})$	$p(\text{Rh—Te})$	$p(\text{Te—Te})$
0	−11.62	8.98	6.01	0.289	0.034
0.25	−11.44	8.88	5.79 ( $1/4$ )	0.328	0.025
			6.13 ( $3/4$ )		

alternating octahedral site occupancies. In fact, for the observed range of compositions, a monoclinic unit cell (a nearly pseudorhombic setting of the hexagonal  $\text{CdI}_2$  aristo-type) can describe the structures of all  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  phases. The two crystallographic sites for the intercalated Rh atoms are occupied in an ordered fashion throughout the range. For  $x \leq 0.5$ , one metal site remains empty, while the other fills to the extent of  $2x$ . For  $x \geq 0.5$ , the metal site filled for  $x = 0.5$  remains filled, while the other fills to the extent of  $2x$ . The significance of this pattern is that linear Rh—Rh—Rh groups, which align parallel to the pseudohexagonal axis, are important components of  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ . As  $x$  increases, average Rh—Te distances monotonically increase from  $2.65$  to  $2.71 \text{ \AA}$  and Rh—Rh distances (in the  $\text{Rh}_3$  units) increase from  $2.72$  to  $2.83 \text{ \AA}$  (see also Figure 1).

The corresponding Ir—Te system in the same composition regime shows only two confirmed compounds,  $\text{IrTe}_2$  and  $\text{Ir}_3\text{Te}_8$ , and a proposed  $\text{IrTe}$  phase.<sup>9</sup>  $\text{IrTe}_2$ , unlike  $\text{RhTe}_2$ , adopts the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type structure. With its small  $c/a$  ratio of  $1.37$  ( $a = 3.928 \text{ \AA}$ ,  $c = 5.381 \text{ \AA}$ ), Jobic et al. contend that there is some weak Te···Te “bonding” between each Te—Ir—Te layer.<sup>2,11</sup>  $\text{Ir}_3\text{Te}_8$ , on the other hand, is isostructural with  $\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_8$ .<sup>12</sup> In  $\text{IrTe}_2$  and

(11) Jobic, S.; Evain, M.; Brec, R.; Rouxel, J.; Jouanneaux, A.; Fitch, A. N. *Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem.* **1991**, 598, 199.

(12) Brostingen, G.; Kjekshus, A. *Acta Chem. Scand.* **1970**, 24, 2993.




**Figure 10.** (a) Variations in total valence electron energies with stoichiometric variables  $u$  and  $x$  in  $\text{Rh}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2$  (defect pyrite-type) and  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  (stuffed  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type). At  $\text{RhTe}_2$ , the pyrite structure is preferred by ca. 0.7 eV. (b)  $\Delta E(x)$  curves for the disproportionation of  $\text{RhTe}_2$  (c) into  $\text{Rh}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2$  (defect pyrite-type) and  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  (stuffed  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type) for various fractions of  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  (stuffed  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type), indicated by  $a$ . The minima for each curve are indicated, and these points are connected by the dotted line.


$\text{Ir}_3\text{Te}_8$ , the Ir–Te distances are 2.65 Å while the Te–Te distances are ca. 2.88 Å in  $\text{Ir}_3\text{Te}_8$ . No details concerning possible intermediate phases  $\text{Ir}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  have yet been reported.

## Methods

The main object of this paper is to elucidate reasons for the observed phases and structures in the group 9 tellurides  $\text{M}_x\text{Te}_2$  using orbital symmetry arguments. The electronic structures of the actual as well as many hypothetical structures were calculated using the LCAO (tight-binding) approximation with the extended Hückel theory.<sup>13</sup> Atomic orbital parameters of a minimal basis set for Rh, Ir, and Te are listed in Table 1. Integrations for total valence electron energies, Mulliken populations, and overlap populations were performed using special-point sets of 50–200  $\mathbf{k}$ -points in the corresponding irreducible wedges of the first Brillouin zones for these structures.<sup>14</sup> For the series  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  ( $0 \leq x \leq 1$ ), the atomic orbital energies for Rh were evaluated in a self-consistent manner, and these values are also listed in Table 1. Further specifics of each calculation are described in the subsequent text.



**Figure 11.** Crystal structures of  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ . Open circles are Te atoms. Filled, black circles are completely occupied Rh sites. Shaded gray circles are partially occupied Rh sites. The shortest Rh–Te and Rh–Rh distances are indicated.




**Figure 12.** Total DOS curve for  $\text{Rh}_{1.5}\text{Te}_2$  with projections from Rh  $z^2$  orbitals and Te atomic orbitals highlighted. The dashed line indicates the calculated Fermi level. The top of the  $z^2$  orbitals is Rh–Rh  $\sigma^*$  with the higher orbital coefficient on the central Rh atom ( $\text{Rh}^{(c)}$ ). Orbitals just above the Fermi level show Rh–Rh  $\pi^*$  character as indicated by its orbital representation.

## Metal Ditellurides: $\text{CdI}_2$ -Type or Pyrite-Type?

One unusual feature of the group 9 ditellurides is the different low-temperature structures for  $\text{RhTe}_2$  and  $\text{IrTe}_2$ . While  $\text{IrTe}_2$  adopts the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type structure,  $\text{RhTe}_2$  forms in the pyrite-type and needs some additional Rh atoms to achieve the layered morphology, e.g.,  $\text{Rh}_{1.15}\text{Te}_2$  (see Figure 2 for “ball-and-stick” and polyhedral representations of each structure). Although both Jobic et al.<sup>2</sup> as well as Burdett et al.<sup>4</sup> have addressed factors leading to one structure type or the other, neither has focused on the group 9 problem in particular. According to the structural formulas for each type,  ${}_{\infty}[\text{MTe}_6]_3$  and  ${}_{\infty}[\text{M}(\text{Te}_2)_6]_6$ , we must consider not only the M-to-Te charge transfer but also the relative strengths of the octahedral ligand fields created by six telluride,  $[-\text{Te}_6]$ , and six ditelluride groups,  $[-(\text{Te}_2)_6]$ . Table 2 summarizes molecular orbital energies for calculations on four “isolated”  $\text{ML}_6$  octahedral fragments: (a)  $[\text{RhTe}_6]$ , (b)  $[\text{Rh}(\text{Te}_2)_6]$ , (c)  $[\text{IrTe}_6]$ , and (d)  $[\text{Ir}(\text{Te}_2)_6]$ . In the ditelluride fragments b and d, the M–Te–Te angle is set at  $98.5^\circ$ , which is the observed Rh–Te–Te angle in  $\text{RhTe}_2$ . With this structural feature, the metal  $e_g$  orbitals will overlap strongly with one of the  $\pi^*$  orbitals from each  $\text{Te}_2$  unit in a  $\sigma$  fashion (1) and very

- (13) (a) Hoffmann, R.; Lipscomb, W. N. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1962**, *36*, 3179, 3189. (b) Hoffmann, R. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1963**, *39*, 1397. (c) Ammeter, J. H.; Bürgi, H.-B.; Thibault, J. C.; Hoffmann, R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1978**, *100*, 3686. (d) Whangbo, M.-H.; Hoffmann, R.; Woodward, R. B. *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **1979**, *366*, 23.
- (14) (a) Chadi, D. J.; Cohen, M. L. *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter* **1975**, *12*, 3060. (b) Ramírez, R.; Böhm, M. C. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **1986**, *30*, 391. (c) Ramírez, R.; Böhm, M. C. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **1988**, *34*, 571.

weakly with the six  $\text{Te}_2 \sigma_p^*$  orbitals (2). The M–Te  $\sigma$ -bonding



$e_g$  orbitals lie well within the occupied Te 5p orbitals, but the M–Te  $\sigma$ -antibonding  $e_g$  orbitals rise to an energy comparable to that calculated for the  $\text{Te}_2 \sigma_p^*$  orbital, as seen in Table 2.

The results from Table 2 may be summarized as follows:


(1)  $\Delta_{\text{oct}}$  values for  $[\text{IrTe}_6]$  and  $[\text{Ir}(\text{Te}_2)_6]$  (3.59 and 3.28 eV, respectively) exceed those for  $[\text{RhTe}_6]$  and  $[\text{Rh}(\text{Te}_2)_6]$  (3.03 and 2.94 eV, respectively). Ir–Te orbital interactions are stronger than Rh–Te interactions due to the relativistic contraction of the Ir valence atomic orbitals relative to Rh. The relativistic effect produces similar sizes for Ir and Rh atoms<sup>15</sup> but larger overlap integrals ( $S_{ij}$ ) for Ir–Te interactions than for Rh–Te interactions. On the other hand, the M d–Te 5p atomic orbital energy difference,  $\Delta E^{(0)}$ , is larger for Ir than for Rh. Since orbital interactions are measured as  $S^2/|\Delta E^{(0)}|$ , the overlap term controls the relative energies of the fragment molecular orbitals.

(2) Weak  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  second nearest neighbor interactions create a “band” of six  $\text{Te}_2 \sigma_p^*$  orbitals. These overlaps, however, are sufficiently large that the bottom of the  $\text{Te}_2 \sigma_p^*$  “band” drops below the energy of the Ir  $e_g$  orbitals within this band but not that of the Rh  $e_g$  orbitals.

As these molecular fragments condense into their respective extended solids, all orbitals broaden into quasicontinuous energy bands. In the  $\text{CdI}_2$  structure, inter- and intralayer  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  interactions push the top of the Te 5p band above the M  $t_{2g}$  orbitals (see Figure 3, which illustrates the total density of states (DOS) and energy bands for  $\text{IrTe}_2$ ). There are a sufficient number of holes in the Te 5p band to create a weakly attractive  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  interaction between  $\text{MTe}_2$  layers, as indicated by their slightly positive overlap population (+0.034 in “ $\text{RhTe}_2$ ”; +0.007 in  $\text{IrTe}_2$ ). This weak “bonding” is the basis for assigning these compounds to the 3D polymeric, 2D derived structures.<sup>2</sup> As the band structure illustrates, these holes are associated with states surrounding the zone center in the Brillouin zone. Furthermore, the M  $t_{2g}$  orbitals are filled. Since the M  $e_g$  band remains well above the Fermi level, the formulation  $\text{M}^{3+}(\text{Te}^{1.5-})_2$  is appropriate for these hexagonal group 9 ditellurides and the Te substructure is a weakly bonded 3D polymerized net.

In the pyrite structure, the  $\text{Te}_2 \sigma_p^*$  orbital splits away from the other Te 5p bands and into the energy range of M  $e_g$  orbitals (see Figure 4, which shows the total DOS for  $\text{RhTe}_2$ ). This collection of three orbitals per formula unit constitutes the conduction band for the group 9 pyrite-type ditellurides and obtains one electron per formula unit. Depending on the relative energies of M  $e_g$  and  $\text{Te}_2 \sigma_p^*$  orbitals, the formulation can range, in principle, from  $\text{M}^{2+}(\text{Te}_2)^{2-}$  (i.e.,  $d^7 \text{M}^{2+}$ ,  $\sigma_p^*$  empty) to  $\text{M}^{3+}(\text{Te}_2)^{3-}$  (i.e.,  $d^6 \text{M}^{3+}$ ,  $\sigma_p^*$  half-filled). The DOS shows, however, that the correct formulation for these compounds is some intermediate description.

Figure 5 illustrates the Te–Te distance that minimizes the total valence electron energy of the dimer  $(\text{Te}_2)^{(2+q)-}$  for a given value of  $q$ . Since the ground-state electronic configuration of



**Figure 13.** Three possible patterns for filling octahedral holes in  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ . Open circles are Te atoms; black circles are completely occupied metal sites; gray circles are partially occupied metal sites. Only a single chain of metal atom sites is illustrated (for clarity).


$(\text{Te}_2)^{(2+q)-}$  is  $(\sigma_s)^2(\sigma_s^*)^2(\sigma_p)^2(\pi)^4(\pi^*)^4(\sigma_p^*)^q$ ,  $q$  represents the population of the antibonding  $\sigma_p^*$  orbital. Figure 5 also indicates Te–Te distances for various transition metal ditellurides. A Mulliken population analysis on pyrite-type  $\text{RhTe}_2$  and “ $\text{IrTe}_2$ ” indicates that the occupied part of the  $e_g/\sigma_p^*$  band is 61% Rh, 39% Te in  $\text{RhTe}_2$  and 55% Ir, 45% Te in “ $\text{IrTe}_2$ ”. From this result and Figure 5, we can conclude that Te is more reduced with Ir in  $\text{IrTe}_2$  than with Rh in  $\text{RhTe}_2$  and that  $\text{RhTe}_2$  has a stronger tendency to form the pyrite-type structure than does  $\text{IrTe}_2$ .

Intermediate-range  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  interactions are also influential in the structural chemistry of tellurides. For the group 9 ditellurides, these interactions are repulsive and sensitive to distance because the orbitals involved have  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  antibonding character. Table 3 lists short and intermediate-range distances in  $\text{RhTe}_2$  and a pyrite-type “ $\text{IrTe}_2$ ”. Also listed are the total valence electron energies for different cutoff distances for the calculation of orbital overlaps (when interatomic distances are greater than this cutoff value, overlap matrix elements,  $S_{ij}$ , are set to zero). When the cutoff is 3.90 Å (close to the van der Waals diameter of Te), the correct “prediction” occurs:  $\text{RhTe}_2$  prefers the pyrite-type;  $\text{IrTe}_2$  prefers the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type. When just the shortest M–Te and Te–Te interactions are used, the pyrite-type structure is preferred. As more orbital overlaps are included (these are mostly intermediate-range Te–Te interactions), the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type becomes favored for both cases, which points to the sensitivity of the Te 5p–5p orbital interactions to distance. The intermediate and longer range Te–Te interactions, which are repulsive as indicated by the calculated shifts in total energy values listed in Table 3, are overestimated by the single- $\zeta$  Slater-type functions assigned to Te. Nevertheless, the calculations demonstrate that these interactions play a critical role in determining structural preference.

The choice of pyrite or  $\text{CdI}_2$  for the structures of group 9 ditellurides (21 valence electrons per formula unit) therefore depends on the relative occupation of the M  $e_g$  and the  $\text{Te}_2 \sigma_p^*$  orbitals, i.e.,  $(e_g)^x(\sigma_p^*)^{1-x}$ , in a pyrite-type structure. The larger  $x$  is, the greater is the tendency to adopt the pyrite arrangement. Due to M–Te, Te–Te, and  $\text{Te}\cdots\text{Te}$  interactions, the value of  $x$  depends not only on the energies of the M  $e_g$  and  $\text{Te}_2 \sigma_p^*$  orbitals but also on their respective bandwidths. The  $e_g$  bandwidth arises from through-bond M– $\text{Te}_2$ –M interactions, and the  $\sigma_p^*$  band-

(15) (a) Pitzer, K. S. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1979**, *12*, 271. (b) Pyykkö, P. *Chem. Rev.* **1988**, *88*, 563.





**Figure 14.** Left: Variations in fractions of Rh oligomers vs  $x$  for Rh<sub>1+x</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> using the three models illustrated in Figure 13. Right: Relative total valence electron energies between these models vs  $x$ .

width, from through-space Te···Te and through-bond Te<sub>2</sub>–M–Te<sub>2</sub> interactions. The band structure calculated for pyrite-type RhTe<sub>2</sub> in Figure 6 shows how these two sets of orbitals are affected by these interactions. In the band structure, there are eight Rh  $e_g$ -related bands and four Te<sub>2</sub>  $\sigma_p^*$ -related bands because there are four formula units per unit cell. The bandwidths are essentially set by the respective band (orbital) energies at the zone center (symmetry is isomorphous with the group  $T_h$ ). The Rh  $e_g$  bands all show gerade character, while the Te<sub>2</sub>  $\sigma_p^*$  bands have ungerade character. Therefore, symmetry allows these bands to cross. The very bottom of this  $e_g/\sigma_p^*$  band has completely  $\sigma_p^*$  character, since the translational symmetry imposes a combination of Te<sub>2</sub>  $\sigma_p^*$  orbitals that cannot overlap

with Rh 5d orbitals and shows slight Te···Te attractive orbital overlaps. Away from the zone center, Rh 5d–Te 5p overlaps rapidly push this band to higher energy, where it eventually crosses the lowest Rh  $e_g$  band. In a hypothetical pyrite-type "IrTe<sub>2</sub>", this band crossing occurs at a higher energy value, such that the Te<sub>2</sub>  $\sigma_p^*$  orbitals would receive more electrons than in RhTe<sub>2</sub>. Thus, we find IrTe<sub>2</sub> in the CdI<sub>2</sub> structure type.


#### Vacancies in the Metal Sites of MTe<sub>2</sub>

Rh<sub>1-u</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> has been characterized as a defect-pyrite-type structure for  $u \leq 0.2$  with random vacancies on the Rh sites. At  $u = 0.25$ , Rh<sub>0.75</sub>Te<sub>2</sub> (i.e., Rh<sub>3</sub>Te<sub>8</sub>) forms with a slight rhombohedral distortion and an ordered vacancy distribution

**Table 5.** Results from Extended Hückel Calculations on  $M_{1+u}Te_2$  for Various Values of  $u^a$ 

$x$	$E_F$ (eV)	$q(Rh^{(o)})$	$q(Rh^{(i)})$	$q(Rh^{(c)})$	$q(Te^{(7)})$	$q(Te^{(8)})$	$q(Te^{(9)})$	$q(Te^{(10)})$	$p(Rh-Te)$	$p(Rh-Rh)$
0.000	-11.6	8.86			6.07				0.30	
0.083	-11.8	8.65	8.71	8.22	6.27	6.01			0.31	-0.01
0.167	-11.7	8.71	8.81	8.44	6.31	6.05			0.31	-0.02
0.250	-11.6	8.81	8.88	8.56	6.30	6.10	6.04		0.30	-0.03
0.333	-11.4	8.79	8.90	8.61	6.38	6.13	5.93		0.28	-0.02
0.500	-11.2		8.96	8.90		6.12	5.97		0.29	-0.02
0.667	-11.1	9.11	9.01	9.12		6.15	5.97	5.78	0.27	-0.02
0.750	-11.0	9.11	9.04	9.14			5.96	5.78	0.26	-0.02
0.833	-10.9	9.13	9.06	9.23			5.98	5.79	0.26	-0.01
1.000	-10.6	9.32						5.68	0.24	-0.03

<sup>a</sup>  $q$  = Mulliken population;  $p(A-B)$  = overlap population between atoms A and B. See Text for descriptions of  $Rh^{(o)}$ ,  $Rh^{(c)}$ , and  $Rh^{(i)}$ .  $Te^{(7)}$ ,  $Te^{(8)}$ ,  $Te^{(9)}$ , and  $Te^{(10)}$  correspond to the Te environments illustrated in 7–10.



**Figure 15.** (a) Relative total valence electron energies vs d electron concentration among the oligomers  $[Rh_3Te_{12}]$ ,  $[Rh_5Te_{18}]$ , and  $[Rh_7Te_{24}]$  with respect to the isolated  $RhTe_6$  octahedral fragment. (b) Relative total valence electron energy vs d electron concentration between  $[Rh_3Te_{12}] + [Rh_7Te_{24}]$  and  $2[Rh_5Te_{18}]$ .

(see Figure 7).<sup>8</sup> Although the rhombohedral lattice constants show very slight changes from the trend in cubic phases, significant differences occur for Te–Te distances. In the unit cell, three  $Te_2$  dimers shorten from ca. 2.89 to 2.82 Å and one  $Te_2$  dimer slightly lengthens (see Figure 1).  $Ir_3Te_8$  is isotypic with  $Rh_3Te_8$ , but there are no reports to our knowledge of  $Ir_{1-u}Te_2$ .<sup>12</sup> There are two important outcomes of these observations: (1) vacancies on the metal sites destabilize the  $CdI_2$ -type relative to the pyrite-type structure and (2) the vacancies affect the bonding in Te–Te dimers for group 9 systems.


To address the first point, we begin with the  $CdI_2$  structure of  $MTe_2$ . Creating metal vacancies in this structure for the group 9 ditellurides removes electrons from the Te 5p band at a rate of 3 times the fraction of vacancies formed. In  $M_{1-u}Te_2$ , the number of orbitals in the valence band is  $11 - 3u$  (this number arises from 4 AO's per Te atom plus  $3(1 - u)$   $t_{2g}$  orbitals per

M atom;  $2(1 - u)$   $e_g$  orbitals remain unoccupied). The maximum number of valence electrons for the valence band is  $2(11 - 3u) = 22 - 6u$ , while the actual number is  $21 - 9u (= 9(1 - u) + 2 \times 6)$ . The difference between these two values is  $1 + 3u$ , which identifies the number of holes in the valence band for  $M_{1-u}Te_2$ . Structurally,  $6u$  Te atoms per formula unit become two-coordinate to the metal as vacancies arise, while the  $2 - 6u$  remaining Te atoms remain three-coordinate. This difference in coordination environments leads to two distinct Mulliken populations for the Te sites. Enhanced  $Te \cdots Te$  lone pair–lone pair repulsions keep the top of the Te 5p band high in energy, so there is a slight increase in the Fermi level. This enhancement in  $Te \cdots Te$  repulsions arises because Te 5s orbitals are allowed to mix with 5p orbitals at the two-coordinate sites due to the reduction in site symmetry. Table 4 summarizes computational results for  $Rh_{1-u}Te_2$  and  $Ir_{1-u}Te_2$ ,  $u = 0$  and 0.25, and Figure 8 illustrates the total DOS for  $Rh_{1-u}Te_2$ ,  $u = 0$  and 0.25. The small peak in the DOS of  $Rh_{0.75}Te_2$  near the Fermi level corresponds to primarily the lone pair orbitals on the two-coordinate Te atoms (this peak is absent in the DOS of  $RhTe_2$ ). The low Mulliken population for the three-coordinate Te sites in this (hypothetical) defect- $CdI_2$  model creates the driving force for forming Te–Te bonds, and this structure is unstable with respect to the defect pyrite-type.


Now, as metal atoms are removed from the pyrite network, the occupied fraction of the  $e_g/\sigma_p^*$  band drops. For  $M_{1-u}Te_2$ , this band has  $3 - 2u$  orbitals per formula unit ( $2 - 2u$  M  $e_g$  plus 1  $Te_2$   $\sigma_p^*$  orbital) and  $1 - 3u$  electrons per formula unit occupying them. Therefore, the occupied fraction varies with  $u$  as  $(1 - 3u)/(6 - 4u)$ : this band becomes empty at  $u = 1/3$ , i.e.,  $M_{2/3}Te_2$ . Observations show, however, that  $u$  reaches a maximum value at 0.25, which represents, on average, one metal site per cubic unit cell. Presumably, the lattice strain created by a vacancy concentration exceeding 25% is not overcome by an electronic driving force to optimize M–Te and Te–Te bonding.

$M_{0.75}Te_2$  ( $u = 0.25$ ) compounds show an ordering of vacancies on the metal network, which gives rise to a rhombohedral structure  $M_3Te_8$ . All M atoms are crystallographically equivalent, while there are two distinct  $Te_2$  dimers in a 3:1 ratio (see Figure 7 for an illustration of this structure; the two different  $Te_2$  dimers are noted). The ideal formulation is  $(M^{3+})_3(Te_2)^{3-}(Te_2)^{2-}_3$ , which corresponds to empty M  $e_g$  orbitals and one electron in a single  $Te_2$   $\sigma_p^*$  orbital. As the DOS in Figure 9 shows, there is still some electron density in the M  $e_g$  orbitals. Furthermore, the bottom of the  $e_g/\sigma_p^*$  band does not change significantly, since it originates largely from the  $\sigma_p^*$  orbitals on the  $Te_2$  groups. The most visible difference between the densities of states for  $RhTe_2$  and  $Rh_3Te_8$  occurs just above the Rh  $t_{2g}$  orbitals, where there is a significant

increase in the contribution from one of the  $\text{Te}_2$  dimers. In  $\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_8$ , one  $\text{Te}_2$  dimer is coordinated to six Rh atoms (**3**); the other three are coordinated to four Rh atoms (**4**), which leaves




a lone pair of electrons on each Te atom. The peak in the DOS above the Rh  $t_{2g}$  orbitals corresponds to these lone pairs. In terms of a delocalized picture, this peak arises via orbital mixing. Since the  $\text{Te}_2$  environment in **4** retains its inversion center, orbital mixing can only take place between gerade or between ungerade orbitals. We assign this small peak to one combination of the mixing between  $\text{Te}_2$   $\sigma_p$  and  $\pi^*$  orbitals (both gerade) (**5a**), which pushes the energy of these  $\pi^*$  orbitals above the



Rh  $t_{2g}$  orbitals. The other combination (**5b**) is near the bottom of the occupied  $\text{Te}_2$  orbitals. As shown in **5a**, this orbital mixing also reduces the strength of the  $\pi^*$  overlap, which provides a driving force for shortening the distances in these Te—Te dimers. For a model of  $\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_8$  based on the cubic pyrite structure and all equal Te—Te distances, the calculated overlap populations indicate two distinctly inequivalent Te—Te bonds (see Table 4), which agrees with experiment and the qualitative analysis above.


The ordered arrangement of vacancies in  $\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_8$  creates just two types of Te—Te dimers (**3** and **4**). Randomizing the vacancy sites would also create five-coordinate  $\text{Te}_2$  groups (**6**). The



energy for the process  $\mathbf{3} + \mathbf{4} \rightarrow 2 \mathbf{6}$  is estimated to be +2.6 eV, which suggests that minimizing the number of five-coordinate  $\text{Te}_2$  groups minimizes the total energy for  $\text{M}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2$ . The primary reason for this large, positive energy difference is the loss of inversion center in **6**, when compared to **3** and **4**. This feature allows complex orbital mixing among the  $\text{Te}_2$   $\sigma_p^*$  and all other occupied  $\text{Te}_2$  orbitals and raises its energy in the conduction band. As more five-coordinate Te—Te groups are introduced, the bottom of the  $\text{M}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2$  conduction band will rise and be replaced by the M  $e_g$  orbitals.


### Disproportionation of $\text{RhTe}_2$

The phase diagram for the Rh—Te binary system shows that  $\text{RhTe}_2$  undergoes disproportionation into a  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2(\text{h})$  and the pyrite-type  $\text{Rh}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2(\text{c})$  at temperatures exceeding ca.






**Figure 16.** Qualitative orbital schemes to explain the curves in Figure 15 by examining the evolution of Rh  $t_{2g}$  and  $e_g$  orbitals as  $[\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_{12}]$ ,  $[\text{Rh}_5\text{Te}_{18}]$ , and  $[\text{Rh}_7\text{Te}_{24}]$  oligomers are created. The  $t_{2g}$  orbitals broaden with Rh—Rh  $\sigma$ -bonding interactions at the bottom and  $\sigma$ -antibonding interactions at the top. The bottom of the  $e_g$  orbitals is Rh—Rh  $\pi$  antibonding.


650 °C.<sup>8</sup> According to this study, both stoichiometric variables,  $x$  and  $u$ , increase with temperature up to 1075 °C, at which point the cubic phase decomposes peritectically. To analyze this process thermodynamically, we need to consider the relative free energies of the pyrite-type phase,  $\text{RhTe}_2(\text{c})$ , and some mixture of  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2(\text{h})$  and  $\text{Rh}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2(\text{c})$ :




This equation's stoichiometry demands that  $a + b = 1$  and  $ax = bu$ . Although it is theoretically difficult to assess all thermodynamic variables needed for an evaluation of free energies, we can evaluate total valence electron energies of both sides of this equation. Figure 10a illustrates the trends in average electronic energy with  $x$  in  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2(\text{h})$  and with  $u$  in  $\text{Rh}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2(\text{c})$ . For small values of  $x$  and  $u$ , the energy changes are nearly linear.  $E(u)$  for  $\text{Rh}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2(\text{c})$  rises as  $u$  increases because  $6u$  Rh—( $\text{Te}_2$ ) interactions are lost;  $E(x)$  for  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2(\text{h})$  drops as  $x$  increases because  $6x$  Rh—Te interactions are created. Combining the two curves in Figure 10a for various combinations of the stoichiometric coefficients  $a$  and  $b$  gives the curves in Figure 10b ( $a = 0.1, 0.25$ , and  $0.4$ ). As  $a$  increases ( $a$  corresponds to the fraction of the  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2(\text{h})$  phase in the mixture),  $x$  decreases (i.e., fewer Rh atoms intercalate into the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type arrangement) and the minimum value of  $\Delta E$  for the disproportionation increases. From the results in Figure 10, we conclude that disproportionation of  $\text{RhTe}_2(\text{c})$  is entropy driven ( $\Delta E$  for the reaction above is always positive). Furthermore, more Rh atoms should transfer from  $\text{Rh}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2(\text{c})$  to  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2(\text{h})$  as temperature increases, which agrees with the observed phase diagram.<sup>8</sup> For the three data points highlighted in Figure 10b, which identify minima in the  $\Delta E(x)$  curves for various values of  $a$ , the corresponding reactions are



These results demonstrate the strong relationship between metal oxidation states and orbital interaction energies. Although




**Figure 17.** Valence  $e_g$  orbitals for the oligomers  $[\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_{12}]$ ,  $[\text{Rh}_5\text{Te}_{18}]$ , and  $[\text{Rh}_7\text{Te}_{24}]$ . Electrons show those orbitals that may be occupied for  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ .



**Figure 18.** (a) Contour plot of the relative energies between  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  and  $\text{Rh}_{1+x-y}\text{Te}_2 + y\text{Rh}$ . The shaded region indicates negative values, i.e., regions in  $(x, y)$  space where  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  is unstable with respect to disproportionation. (b) Total valence electron energy,  $E(x)$ , vs  $x$  for  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ . The observed curve is quadratic and is compared to a linear variation. The quadratic curve forms the basis for the contour plot in part a.

difficult to visualize on the energy scale of the plot in Figure 10a, neither curve is strictly linear over the entire range of  $u$  or  $x$ . As  $u$  increases in  $\text{Rh}_{1-u}\text{Te}_2(c)$ , the oxidation state of Rh changes very little (see Table 4) but intermediate-range  $\text{Te}_2 \cdots \text{Te}_2$  interactions increase and cause an upward deviation of its energy curve. Also, as  $x$  increases in  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2(h)$ , both Rh and Te are increasingly reduced. Since orbital interactions increase with  $|\Delta E^{(0)}|^{-1}$  and since  $E^{(0)}(\text{Rh } 5d)$  rises with decreasing oxidation state, the strength of Rh–Te orbital interactions drops as  $x$  increases. Therefore, the energy curve for  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2(h)$  also deviates upward. We address this trend for  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2(h)$  in more detail in the next section. These two secondary effects, therefore, determine the shapes of the curves in Figure 10b.



**Figure 19.** Total DOS curve and COOP curves for NiAs-type “RhTe”. The dashed line indicates the calculated Fermi level. The projection of Rh 4d orbitals to the total DOS is also indicated. The COOP curves show overlap populations for the shortest Rh–Te and Rh–Rh contacts. (+) is a region of bonding interactions; (–) is a region of antibonding interactions.

### Self-Intercalated $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$

Detailed crystallographic and thermodynamic studies of  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  indicate continuous behavior for  $0.15 \leq x \leq 0.84$ .<sup>7,10</sup> Their structures are derived from the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -structure type with layers of octahedral holes occupied in an alternating pattern of 100% and 100x%. In fact, all structures can be indexed using a monoclinic unit cell that is a slight deviation from the orthorhombic cell of the 2D hexagonal lattice. This cell involves two  $\text{MTe}_2$  layers in the hexagonal  $c$  direction with  $2x$  additional M atoms between them. These additional metal atoms can occupy two crystallographically inequivalent sites in the space group  $I2/m$  (Wyckoff sites 2a and 2d). For  $x \leq 1/2$ , the 2d site remains empty while the 2a site fills at the rate  $2x$ . For  $x > 1/2$ , the 2d position fills at a rate  $2x$  and the 2a site remains filled. Thus, crystallographic analysis indicates a nonrandom mechanism for filling the empty metal sites in the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type structure.


In  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ , all Rh atoms are octahedrally coordinated by Te atoms. The observed filling pattern for  $x \leq 1/2$  creates linear  $\text{Rh}_3$  groups of three face-sharing octahedra.  $\text{Rh}_{1.5}\text{Te}_2$ , the upper limit for this field of structures, contains only these oligomers. For  $x$  exceeding  $1/2$ , longer oligomers are possible, e.g.,  $\text{Rh}_7$ ,  $\text{Rh}_{11}$ , ...,  $\text{Rh}_{4n+3}$ , etc., and approach quasi-infinite chains, as found in the NiAs structure type. Figure 11 illustrates the two different cases (black circles are 100% Rh; gray circles are partially occupied metal sites). We can formulate the compounds  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  in two different ways to emphasize the presence of the trimers: (1)  $x \leq 1/2$ ,  $(\text{Rh}_3)_x\text{Rh}_{1-2x}\text{Te}_2$ ; (2)  $x \geq 1/2$ ,  $(\text{Rh}_3)_{1-x}\text{Rh}_{4x-2}\text{Te}_2$ . Table 5 summarizes the results of calculations on the entire series  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ . We have separated the Mulliken populations for Rh (symbolized by  $q$ ) into three contributions: (1) the central Rh atom in each  $\text{Rh}_3$  unit,  $\text{Rh}^{(c)}$ ;



(2) the terminal Rh atoms in each trimer,  $\text{Rh}^{(0)}$ ; and (3) the remaining Rh atoms,  $\text{Rh}^{(c)}$ . According to the site occupation pattern, the  $\text{Rh}^{(c)}$  atoms represent the metal atoms between each “ $\text{RhTe}_2$ ” layer, i.e.,  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2 = (\text{Rh}^{(c)})_x(\text{Rh}^{(0)})_{1-2x}(\text{Rh}^{(0)})_{2x}\text{Te}_2$ . For  $x < 1/2$ , these  $\text{Rh}^{(c)}$  atoms are the most electron deficient among the Rh sites. The terminal positions of the trimers are the most electron rich. At  $\text{Rh}_{1.5}\text{Te}_2$ , no  $\text{Rh}^{(0)}$  remain, and the distributions of electrons between  $\text{Rh}^{(c)}$  and  $\text{Rh}^{(0)}$  sites are nearly equal. For  $x > 1/2$ , however, the opposite trend occurs. Electron density builds up on the  $\text{Rh}^{(c)}$  sites rather than the  $\text{Rh}^{(0)}$  sites.

Figure 12 illustrates the total DOS for  $\text{Rh}_{1.5}\text{Te}_2$  and highlights the Rh  $z^2$  projection and Te atomic orbital projections. The Fermi level lies just above the top of the  $z^2$  band, which has Rh–Rh  $\sigma^*$  character and represents the top of the Rh  $t_{2g}$  orbitals. With the  $t_{2g}$  band formally filled, the distributions of electrons between  $\text{Rh}^{(c)}$  and  $\text{Rh}^{(0)}$  are essentially equal. For  $x$  values below  $1/2$ , electrons are removed from the top of the  $z^2$  band, which, according to its orbital representation in the DOS, has its greatest component on  $\text{Rh}^{(c)}$ . Therefore,  $\text{Rh}^{(0)}$  sites are more electron rich. On the other hand, for  $x$  values above  $1/2$ , electrons enter a Rh–Rh  $\pi^*$  band, which also has its greatest component on  $\text{Rh}^{(c)}$ . For these cases,  $\text{Rh}^{(c)}$  is more electron rich.

The vacancy distribution also affects the local electronic structure at tellurium. Since the Te substructure changes very little, the average coordination of Te by Rh increases linearly with additional Rh atoms as  $3 + 3x$ . The coordination polyhedra, due to the pattern of site occupancies, will be one of the four environments, **7–10**, derived from a trigonal prism. For  $x = 0$ ,



i.e., “ $\text{RhTe}_2$ ”, only **7** occurs. For  $x < 1/2$ , the arrangement of Rh atoms allows **7–9** to coexist.  $\text{Rh}_{1.5}\text{Te}_2$  ( $=\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_4$ ) represents a special case with 50% **8** and 50% **9**. For  $x > 1/2$ , we find **8–10** as possible coordination environments for Te. Finally, at  $x = 1$ , i.e., “ $\text{RhTe}$ ”, only **10** is possible. As Table 5 shows, the Mulliken populations for the various Te atoms decrease by ca. 0.2 unit (electron) as the coordination number increases by 1. Furthermore, as  $x$  increases, the atomic population of Te increases monotonically for a given coordination environment.

An interesting result shown in Table 5 is the drop in the Fermi level from “ $\text{RhTe}_2$ ” to  $\text{Rh}_{1.08}\text{Te}_2$ . Beyond  $\text{Rh}_{1.08}\text{Te}_2$ ,  $E_F$  monotonically increases. We attribute the drop to the presence of four- and five-coordinate Te atoms, **8** and **9**, in the structures of  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  for small  $x$  values. The addition of  $x$  Rh atoms to “ $\text{RhTe}_2$ ” creates environments **8** and **9**, which removes  $3x$  Te orbitals near the Fermi level ( $3x$  levels become Rh–Te bonding;  $3x$  levels become Rh–Te antibonding). Together with  $3x$  Rh  $t_{2g}$  orbitals, there are now  $6x$  new orbitals in the valence band which get only  $9x$  electrons from the  $x$  Rh atoms. Thus,  $E_F$  drops for the initial stages of “self-intercalation” in “ $\text{RhTe}_2$ ”.

There are certainly other ways of filling the octahedral vacancies in the  $\text{CdI}_2$  structure type in addition to the observed one. Such patterns have been identified in other chalcogenides, e.g., in titanium and chromium sulfides.<sup>16</sup> During the refinements

of  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ , Abadie et al. considered two additional possibilities.<sup>7</sup> One alternative arrangement of filled and vacant metal sites, which maintains the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type framework, leads to the space group  $P\bar{3}m1$ , and each vacant metal site fills at a rate  $x$ . The other alternative, with space group  $P6_3/mmc$ , considers a completely random distribution of vacancies throughout the metal substructure. These patterns are illustrated in Figure 13. The black circles represent completely occupied metal sites; the gray circles are partially occupied. Model A is the observed pattern and has two distinct representations for  $x \leq 1/2$  and  $x \geq 1/2$ . Models B and C can be represented by a single pattern for the entire range of  $x$ .

The fraction of oligomers varies with  $x$  in  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  for each of the three models mentioned above. Within the assigned unit cell, i.e., four layers of metal atoms, these fractions are illustrated in Figure 14A–C and the corresponding trends in total valence electron energy are shown in Figure 14D. Due to the distribution of vacancies in model A, for  $x \leq 1/2$ , only  $\text{Rh}_3$  units are possible. For  $x > 1/2$ , the possible oligomers include  $\text{Rh}_{4n+3}$ , i.e.,  $\text{Rh}_3$ ,  $\text{Rh}_7$ ,  $\text{Rh}_{11}$ , etc. The fraction of  $\text{Rh}_7$  oligomers reaches as maximum at  $x = 0.75$ . In model B, the possible oligomers are  $\text{Rh}_{2n+3}$  and their fraction maximizes at  $x = 0.50$ . For model C, all oligomers are possible.


With respect to total valence electron energies, model A, in which the fraction of  $\text{Rh}_3$  groups is maximized for all values of  $x$ , is slightly favored over model B for  $x$  less than  $1/2$ . As  $x$  grows above  $1/2$ , model A becomes even more favored because this pattern also minimizes the fraction of quasi-infinite chains in the structure. The totally random arrangement of occupied metal sites is significantly higher in energy and only becomes energetically competitive when  $x$  approaches 1.00, i.e., the NiAs type. As we have demonstrated, the difference between models A and B is the types of oligomers allowed by the distribution of vacancies. In Figure 15a, we illustrate the variation of total valence electron energies for  $[\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_{12}]$ ,  $[\text{Rh}_5\text{Te}_{18}]$ , and  $[\text{Rh}_7\text{Te}_{24}]$  chains relative to a  $[\text{RhTe}_6]$  octahedral fragment over all d electron concentrations. All curves are very similar. The trends from  $d^0$  to  $d^6$  per metal atom follow from the large  $\sigma$  overlap between adjacent  $z^2$  orbitals: bonding at low d counts, antibonding at high d counts in the set of  $t_{2g}$  orbitals. As the length of the metal chain increases, the bandwidth of the  $z^2$  orbitals increases. On the other hand, the trends from  $d^6$  to  $d^{10}$  per metal atom follow from Rh–Te–Rh through-bond coupling. The bottom of the set of  $e_g$  orbitals has Rh–Rh  $\pi^*$  character and very little Rh–Te overlap. The top of this set is Rh–Rh  $\pi$  bonding but shows significant Rh–Te  $\sigma$ -antibonding character. Figure 16 shows the dispersion of Rh  $t_{2g}$  and  $e_g$  orbitals that leads to these relative energy curves.

A subtle difference between models A and B is that model B allows  $\text{Rh}_5$  chains, while model A does not. Figure 15b illustrates the relative energies for  $[\text{Rh}_3\text{Te}_{12}] + [\text{Rh}_7\text{Te}_{24}]$  and  $2[\text{Rh}_5\text{Te}_{18}]$  chains. Between  $d^6$  and  $d^7$ , the  $\text{Rh}_3$  and  $\text{Rh}_7$  chains are slightly preferred over the  $\text{Rh}_5$  chains, which agrees with the structural models of Abadie for  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ .<sup>7</sup> We can understand this result by examining the qualitative orbital diagrams for the  $e_g$  bands of these three chains in Figure 17. The occupied orbitals are noted with electron symbols. The HOMO's for the  $\text{Rh}_3$  and  $\text{Rh}_7$  chains have similar features because the one node in the  $\text{Rh}_7$  orbital creates two  $\text{Rh}_3$  groups. The energy of the HOMO of the  $\text{Rh}_5$  chain lies above those for  $\text{Rh}_3$  and  $\text{Rh}_7$  because its node creates two  $\text{Rh}_2$  groups instead. Therefore, between  $d^6$  and  $d^7$  metal configurations, i.e., up to a  $1/4$ -filled  $e_g$  band,  $\text{Rh}_{4n+3}$  chains are preferred over  $\text{Rh}_{4n+1}$  chains.

(16) (a) Jellinek, F. *Acta Crystallogr.* **1957**, *10*, 620. (b) Flink, E.; Wiegers, G. A.; Jellinek, F. *Recl. Trav. Chim. Pays-Bas.* **1966**, *85*, 869. (c) Pearson, W. B. *The Crystal Chemistry and Physics of Metals and Alloys*; Wiley-Interscience: New York, 1972; p 461.



To study the energetics involved in setting the upper limit of composition, we have calculated the energy changes for the series of reactions



This disproportionation reduces the number of Rh–Rh antibonding interactions along the *c* axis as  $\text{Rh}_{1+x-y}\text{Te}_2$  forms. Our results obtained the contour plot in Figure 18a, which shows  $\Delta E(x,y)$  for this reaction. For the ranges,  $0 \leq x \leq 1$  and  $0 \leq y \leq x$ ,  $\Delta E(x,y)$  varies between ca.  $-4$  and  $+16$  eV. The shaded region identifies negative  $\Delta E(x,y)$  values and corresponds to the range of *x* and *y* where  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$  is unstable relative to  $\text{Rh}_{1+x-y}\text{Te}_2$  and Rh. According to our results, this instability begins for *x* approximately 0.7, with small energy differences ( $\Delta E(x,y) < 0.05$  eV) and becomes more significant as *x* increases. Although not in exact agreement with experiment (disproportionation must begin around  $x = 0.84$ ), the phenomenon is clearly reproduced by our calculations.

To understand the upper limit in phase stability for  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ , we plot the trend in  $E(\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2)$  vs *x* ( $0 \leq x \leq 1$ ) in Figure 18b (note: this is an expanded version of Figure 10a). As Rh atoms are incorporated into the van der Waals gap of the  $\text{CdI}_2$ -type arrangement, the total valence electron energy drops due to more Rh–Te interactions, but the rate of decrease drops as *x* increases. This quadratic behavior in the total energy arises for two primary reasons: (1) As *x* increases, more repulsive (antibonding) orbital interactions between Rh atoms along the *c* axis occur and the Rh atoms become more reduced (see Table 5). (2) Rh–Te–Te–Rh through-bond coupling creates antibonding interactions between nearest neighbor Rh atoms, whose repulsive nature becomes more influential as the concentration

of Rh increases. At the upper compositional limit, we reach the NiAs-type “RhTe”. Figure 19 illustrates the total DOS and Rh–Te and Rh–Rh COOP curves for this hypothetical compound. The Rh  $e_g$  band contains one valence electron, which occupies Rh–Rh antibonding orbitals and essentially Rh–Te nonbonding orbitals. Furthermore, as Rh becomes more reduced, its atomic orbital energies increase relative to the atomic orbital energies of Te (see the  $H_{ii}$  values obtained from charge iteration calculations on “RhTe<sub>2</sub>”,  $\text{Rh}_{1.5}\text{Te}_2$ , and “RhTe” in Table 1). Since orbital interactions are measured as  $S_{ij}^2/|\Delta E^{(0)}|$  and  $\Delta E^{(0)}$  between Rh and Te atomic orbitals increases with *x*, the strength of Rh–Te orbital interactions are reduced as *x* increases and we observe the quadratic behavior of  $E(x)$  in Figure 18b.

## Conclusions

Semiempirical electronic structure calculations are able to elucidate the orbital interactions that influence the observed behavior of group 9 tellurides,  $\text{M}_x\text{Te}_2$  ( $0.75 \leq x \leq 2.00$ ). The distribution of vacancies in the various structures are closely linked to the structural moieties left behind, e.g., six- and four-coordinate Te–Te groups in  $\text{Rh}_{1-x}\text{Te}_2$  and linear  $\text{Rh}_3$  and  $\text{Rh}_7$  groups in  $\text{Rh}_{1+x}\text{Te}_2$ . Analyses of the DOS curves, COOP curves, and band structures, coupled with a detailed examination of total valence electron energy surfaces, provide the rationale for their behavior. We are continuing to generalize this procedure to other intermetallic systems by considering vacancies in extended solids from a local chemical perspective.

**Acknowledgment.** This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant DMR-96-27161.

IC990652S